DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 262 CE 067 401

AUTHOR	Marr, Barbara T.; Green, James L., Ed.
TITLE	Title IIB of the Job Training Partnership Act. The Summer Youth Employment and Training Programs of Massachusetts.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education, Boston.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	62p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Differences; Educational Benefits; Educational Objectives; *Employment Programs; Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; *Job Training; Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; Records (Forms); Regional Characteristics; Secondary Education; State Programs; State Surveys; *Summer Programs; *Vocational Education; Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Job Training Partnership Act 1982 Title IIB; *Massachusetts; *Summer Youth Employment Program

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of Massachusetts' Summer Youth Employment and Training Programs (SYETP) funded under Title IIB of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The study methodology included the following: a review of federal JTPA legislation and pertinent state policy directives; site visits to a random sampling of 15 summer programs in 7 service delivery areas (SDAs); and interviews with SDA directors and SYETP coordinators, supervisors, teachers, guidance counselors, and enrollees. Regional/local differences between SYETPs were identified along with innovative practices. Massachusetts' SYETPs were concluded to be valuable supplemental learning programs through which youth can learn needed skills and develop good attitudes, social interaction skills, self-confidence, and awareness of different academic paths and the skills required for employment. Among the study recommendations were the following: selection/training of SYETP instructors and counselors should reflect the need for thorough understanding of the clientele served; planning for summer programs should begin in late winter; systems for reporting outcomes and compiling end-of-year program reports should be improved, and linkages should be developed between JTPA IIB programs and year-round school programs. (Appended are tables detailing trends in Title IIB funding and enrollment, and the interview instruments and participant evaluation forms.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 262

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education

1993

TITLE IIB OF THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

The Summer Youth Employment and Training Programs of Massachusetts

Prepared by
Barbara T. Marr

Edited by
James L. Green
Executive Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

CF067461

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL
ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Officers:

Gloria J. Williams, Chair
Arthur Osborn, Jr., Treasurer
Paul Bento, Secretary

Members:

Christopher Borden
Raymond Jackson
Philip W. Mason
Michael J. Murphy
Charlotte A. Scott
William J. Spring
Laura R. Studen
Albert Todesca
Roger Van Winkle

James L. Green, Executive Director
Barbara T. Marr, Executive Assistant

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments page 1

Purpose of Study page 2

Introduction page 3

Summary of Methodology page 5

I. JTPA IIB Legislation page 6
- A. Legislated Goals
- B. Policy Directives
- C. Performance Measures

II. Allocation of Funding page 9
- A. Funding Requirements
- B. Emergency Allocations

III. Discussion page 11
- A. Regional, Local Differences
- B. Selected Program Descriptions and Innovations

IV. Findings page 23
- A. SYETP As a Supplemental Learning Program
- B. Intangible Benefits
- C. Challenges and Limitations of a Summer Program
- D. Meeting the Goals of JTPA

V. Conclusion page 33

VI. Recommendations page 35

Appendices page 39
1. Chart E2
1A. Chart F2
2. Trends in Title IIB Funding 1984-1992
3. JTPA IIB Enrollment Levels 1984-1992
4. Interview Instruments
5. JTPA IIB Emergency Fund Increases
6. JTPA IIB Emergency Enrollment Expansion
7. SYETP Participant Evaluation forms

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education acknowledges the contributions of those who offered their time and expertise in preparing this report. We would like to express our gratitude to the many Service Delivery Area (SDA) Directors, Summer Program Coordinators and JTPA IIB program staff who coordinated our site visits, participated in interviews and shared important information and viewpoints. We thank Judy Selesnick, Director of the Job Training Partnership Association of Massachusetts, and Phyllis Lary, Director of the North Central Regional Employment Board, for their guidance and assistance during the planning of this report. We also thank Kathy Day, Christine Karavites and Gene White of the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training for their expertise and provision of important research data.

James L. Green, Executive Director of the Council, edited this report and devoted his time to the guidance and oversight of the project. We also would like to recognize and thank Dan Sutton, a Masters degree candidate at the University of Massachusetts Graduate School of Education, who assisted in our program site visits and personal interviews.

The efforts of all of these individuals contributed to the production of this final report and to our increased understanding of the dynamics and practices of the JTPA IIB summer programs in the Commonwealth.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-392) requires the State Council on Vocational Education to evaluate biennially the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Specifically, the Council's federal mandate is to evaluate the "job training program delivery system assisted under the Job Training Partnership Act in terms of such delivery system's adequacy and effectiveness in achieving the purposes of the Act."[1] In keeping with the Council's past practice, the evaluation that follows focuses on a specific element of JTPA. It examines Title IIB, the Summer Youth Employment and Training Programs (SYETP).

The decision of the Council to focus on Title IIB of JTPA was jointly agreed upon as a result of a series of discussions with the Service Delivery Area (SDA) Directors of the Commonwealth's job training system. The Council embarked upon this study with two broad objectives: 1) To collaborate with the local JTPA system by conducting an evaluation that would enhance the general understanding of youth serving programs, and 2) To provide observations, findings and recommendations that would be useful to SDAs and to state and local policy makers. In satisfying these goals, the Council fulfills its federal mandate and, more importantly, provides a service of particular value to the Commonwealth.

[1]Section 112 (10)(A)(ii) of the Perkins Act

INTRODUCTION

President Reagan signed the Job Training Partnership Act into law on October 13, 1982. The Summer Youth Employment and Training programs legislated under Title IIB of JTPA have been operating in Massachusetts since the summer of 1984. The IIB programs are locally planned and administered in each of the state's sixteen Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). These summer programs serve economically disadvantaged youth, aged 14 to 21 years old, and run for an average of six to eight weeks during the summer months.

In 1984, the federal government allocated $20.3 million to Massachusetts for these programs and 17,600 youths were served. In the ensuing years, Title IIB funding continually decreased in Massachusetts, to a low of $11.1 million in 1990.[2] Healthy economic conditions and low unemployment during the 1980s caused a reduction in funding levels, as the unemployment rate is a major variable in the federal funding formula. In 1992, with high unemployment, Massachusetts' allocations rose again to $20.5 million. However, in contrast to the number of youth served with a comparable allocation in 1984, the $20.5 million allocation in 1992 was planned to fund service to 11,700 youth. The service level had decreased as a result of programmatic and economic changes. While the IIB programs were strictly work experience in 1984, by 1992 the program mix included more academic activities. Academic programs brought additional expenses with mandated pre- and post- testing of all participants and a need for additional instructors and classroom space. Work experience programs were still prevalent, but because they are restricted to public and private non-profit organizations, there were fewer such work opportunities due to the state's economic decline. Inflation and a higher minimum wage also contributed to the increased operating expenses of the summer programs.

Still, $20.5 million represents a considerable investment in the job training system. Given these financial resources and the potential to positively impact youth during the summer months, the State Council considers this evaluation to be of major significance.

An unanticipated sequence of events further emphasized the timeliness and relevance of this study. The Los Angeles riots of April, 1992, refocused public attention on the current condition and uncertain future of America's urban youth. These events were a powerful reminder of the problems facing our educational, training and social systems

[2] See Appendix for the JTPA IIB allocations and enrollment levels for Massachusetts by year, from 1984 through 1992.

in providing youth the skills, self-esteem and motivation needed for success in school and in the workplace. The federal government responded to this crisis by infusing over $500 million for the summer of 1992 into JTPA's summer youth programs across the country.[3] Massachusetts Title IIB programs received more than $13 million, bringing its total allocation for calendar year 1992 to over $33.8 million. With this additional funding the SDAs increased their JTPA IIB service population from a planned level of 11,700 youth to over 18,900 youth actually served.

Exactly how are these federal monies being used? The answer to this question is not one-dimensional and is influenced by local and regional factors. This report looks at this issue qualitatively, rather than quantitatively. It assesses the degree to which the job training system meets its legislated goals and explores the content and innovative features of selected summer programs. The report concludes with several findings and recommendations, aimed at furthering the effectiveness of summer programs in enhancing the occupational and academic readiness of Massachusetts youth.

[3] This additional money was legislated under the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, P.L. 102-302, signed into law June 6, 1992.

SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

The research conducted for this report consisted of document review, data collection, program site visits and interviews. Federal JTPA legislation and specific state Policy Directives on Cost Classification, Allocations, Procurement/Contracting, Eligibility, Operations, as well as the Implementation of the 1992 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act (i.e., emergency funding) were carefully reviewed. The planning documents and End-of-Year Summary and Performance Reports for each SDA's summer program were also analyzed to determine spending levels, youth participation, program descriptions and outcomes.

The most valuable and informative parts of the research were the site visits to over fifteen summer programs in seven SDAs. These visits provided unique opportunities to observe the IIB programs first hand, to interview SDA Directors, SDA Summer Program Coordinators, individual program supervisors, teachers, guidance counselors and to talk to the youth participants themselves. The Appendix includes the questionnaires that were developed and used as interview guidelines. Interviewees were told that the information presented in this report would respect the confidentiality of the participating organizations and individuals. Thus, all interview comments and program descriptions shall remain anonymous. The written text refers to programs generically.

This report cannot and does not try to comment on the entire inventory of JTPA IIB programs in the Commonwealth's sixteen SDAs. Rather, the report is based upon a random sampling of IIB programs that is considered representative of the state's job training delivery system.

I. JTPA IIB LEGISLATION

A. Legislated Goals

This analysis of JTPA legislation is based upon the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (P.L. 97-300), effective while we were conducting our research. It does not reflect the changes in JTPA that were legislated under the Job Training Reform Amendments (P.L. 102-367) signed into law on September 7, 1992, which are to become effective July 1, 1993.

The 1982 JTPA law states the three purposes of the Summer Youth Employment and Training programs as follows:

> (1) to enhance the basic educational skills of youth
> (2) to encourage school completion, or enrollment in supplementary or alternative school programs; and
> (3) to provide eligible youth with exposure to the world of work.[4]

The law requires that these programs operate during the period of May 1 to September 30 inclusive. Eligible participants are defined as economically disadvantaged youth, aged 16 to 21 years old, who reside in the SDA. Economically disadvantaged individuals aged 14 and 15 years old may also be eligible if so provided in the SDA's Job Training Plan. All of the SDAs in Massachusetts serve 14 and 15 year-old youth. Work experience programs funded by JTPA IIB may operate only in non-profit organizations, in the public or private sector.[5]

B. Policy Directives

Federal SYETP requirements are interpreted at the state level via specific state standards and policies that guide the implementation of federal law. The Massachusetts State Department of Employment and Training issues Policy Directives to assist the

---

[4] Section 251 of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982

[5] Some SDAs operate summer youth programs in private, for-profit companies, but these programs are not funded by JTPA IIB funds.

SDAs in interpreting and complying with JTPA federal mandates. Examples of policy directives relative to this report are highlighted below:

- Policy Directive 92-06, issued in May 1992, states "The Department of Employment and Training strongly encourages Regional Employment Boards (PICs) to emphasize programs that provide remedial education, training, vocational education, and life skills."[6] This directive calls for the assessment (testing) of reading and math levels of all SYETP participants both at the start and the end of the summer program to measure competency gains and achievement. It also provides rules for the complex processes of eligibility determination and verification.

- Policy Directive 92-03, issued in February of 1992, contains guidelines for the procurement of employment and training services and SDA/program operator contracts. Each SDA normally contracts out its summer programs with a variety of "service providers" (contractors and vendors). There are strict requirements and processes for procurement planning, requests for proposals, competitive bidding, solicitations, contract negotiation, contract monitoring and cost and price analysis.

- Policy Directive 92-04, issued on June 25, 1992, informed the SDAs of the emergency funds approved by Congress and President Bush and the specific amount to be distributed to each SDA. Policy Directive 92-10, issued in July of 1992, provided guidelines for utilizing the emergency fund allocations. Both Directives required the SDAs to immediately expand their IIB programs by adding eligible youth and additional worksites, while still complying with pre-existing statutory requirements and regulations. The SDAs were concerned about the potential difficulties of implementing these directives because most procurements had already taken place in the spring.

C. Performance Measures

Each SDA translates the federally mandated purposes of JTPA IIB into their own program goals and objectives. According to JTPA law, "each service delivery area shall establish written program goals and objectives which shall be used for evaluating the effectiveness of (summer) programs...Such goals and objectives may include —

(1) improvement in school retention and completion;

---

[6] Policy Directive 92-06, dated May 1, 1992, page 2.

(2) improvement in academic performance, including mathematics and reading comprehension;
(3) improvement in employability skills; and
(4) demonstrated coordination with other community service organizations..."[7]

Specific *federal* performance standards do not exist to measure the achievement of these goals and objectives. The State Department of Employment and Training does ask the SDAs to report information on specific performance indicators, as seen in Charts E2 and F2 found in the Appendix. The indicator that receives the most significant response is that of "Completed Program Objectives," also referred to as a "positive termination." For example, if a participant regularly attends the program throughout its duration, or attains the work/academic competencies specific to their participation, that is considered a positive result in terms of program and performance objectives.

Another SDA measurement of performance is losses or gains in academic proficiency between the scores of the pre-program assessment tests and the post-program assessment tests. During the summer it is not uncommon for students to experience a decline in academic skills. Therefore, SDAs look at least to maintain, if not necessarily improve, the participants' math and reading levels determined through pre-testing.

In practice, it is a considerable achievement for an SDA to fully meet the objectives of IIB programs as stated in the law. Our site visits and interviews did affirm many instances of high performance and participant progress. However, overall performance and progress beyond measurable criteria such as program completion is often difficult to establish. *Intangible* outcomes frequently provided more compelling indicators of the summer program benefits.

[7] Section 255 (b) of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982

II. ALLOCATION OF FUNDING

A. Funding Requirements

Massachusetts receives notification in January from the U.S. Department of Labor for its JTPA Title IIB allotment for the upcoming summer. Through a JTPA funding formula based upon the total number of poor, unemployed and "excess unemployed"[8] in the state, the IIB allotment is then distributed among the SDAs. The SDAs must allocate their costs into three basic categories: Administrative costs, Participant Support costs, and Training costs.[9]

Administrative costs may not exceed 15% of the SDA's total allocation. This category consists of direct and indirect costs associated with the supervision and management of programs.

Participant Support costs are not subject to any limitations and include work experience wages, supportive services, and needs-based payments. Supportive services are services necessary to enable an individual to participate in a JTPA program, such as transportation, health care, special services and materials for the handicapped, and meals. Needs-based payments are locally determined and usually represent financial compensation to participants in classroom training and other academic programs. Work experience wages are set at the minimum wage of $4.25 per hour, although some SDAs pay up to $5.00 per hour, either as a standard rate or as a raise for exceptional performance. In a down economy, these payments serve as an added incentive for the youth to participate in IIB programs. In a healthy economy, youth can often secure higher paying summer jobs on their own.

The training cost category essentially covers training service and operation costs other than wages, needs-based payments and supportive services. This includes instructor salaries, teacher training, testing materials, books and other teaching aids, equipment and supplies for participant training, classroom space and utility costs. Participant outreach, recruitment, intake selection, orientation and assessment materials are also expenses classified as training costs.

---

[8] Policy Directive 91-01, dated January 25, 1991, defines "excess unemployed" as the number of unemployed *in excess of* 4.5% of the labor force in areas with greater than a 4.5% unemployment rate.
[9] Cost classification is documented in Policy Directives 92-06 and 90-16.

SDAs vary significantly in their distribution of funds to the different types of summer programs. Typical program classifications are: work experience, academic remediation, vocational exploration, English-As-A-Second-Language and pre-employment skills training. In the summer of 1992, one SDA allocated 70% of its training funds to work experience; another SDA allocated less than 40% to work experience. SDAs have a large degree of flexibility and autonomy in determining what programs they will fund and what level of funding particular programs will receive.

B. Emergency Allocations

Massachusetts received over $13.3 million in emergency funds in June of 1992 for its 1992 summer programs. Based upon the same formula used for the original state apportionment, each SDA's IIB funding increased by approximately 59%.[10] The Boston SDA was selected as one of 75 national targeted cities, and as such doubled its funding, from $2.19 million to $4.85 million. Although the law permits SDAs to carry IIB funds over from one calendar year to the next year's SYETP, the SDAs were expected to utilize these emergency allocations during the 1992 SYETP.

As noted in the explanation of Policy Directives, SDAs were directed to expand their IIB programs by recruiting additional eligible youth and adding more worksites. As a result, statewide summer program participation totaled 57% more than originally planned. For the individual SDAs, this meant enrollment increases ranging from 200 new youth to over 1,000 new youth per SDA.[11] Most of the new participants were channeled into existing programs. There were only a limited number of new programs added due to the extremely short timelines for new vendor procurement and program planning. Additional methods SDAs used to expend the funds included lengthening hours of the work day and/or extending program duration by one to three weeks.

---

[10] See the Appendix at the end of the report for a chart of the Emergency Allocations by SDA.
[11] See the Appendix for a chart documenting the participation increase by SDA as a result of the emergency funding.

III. DISCUSSION

The following discussion of regional influences and program characteristics is principally based upon our site visits. However, the SDAs' planning documents and End-of-Year Reports for their IIB programs were also utilized as resources to inform this discussion.

A. Regional, Local Differences

Each SDA develops and implements a unique mix of IIB programs that reflect the regional and local characteristics of the different communities in that SDA. The SDA's youth demographics, economic conditions, unemployment rate, labor market needs and area school systems all influence how the SDA invests and administers the IIB funds. JTPA legislation designed the SYETP to meet the needs and goals of the local eligibility pool, which are those individuals who meet the JTPA IIB eligibility requirements.[12] The flexibility and autonomy given to the SDAs in planning their summer programs represent a key element of Title IIB, as it allows the SDAs to accommodate local variance. While specific federal and regional program goals exist, each SDA, and even an individual program, can pursue different means of achieving the same goals. However, due to local differences, one region's program(s) may not be as effective if implemented in another region.

The characteristics of the local eligibility pool, or JTPA IIB service population, play one part in the development of the IIB programs. The SDAs rely on census data and the local school system(s) for obtaining information on the quantity and composition of the area's economically disadvantaged youth who are eligible for SYETP participation. The racial and ethnic mix of IIB service populations varies considerably, with some service populations predominately Hispanic or black, some predominately white, and others representing a balanced mix of Hispanic, white, black and Asian youth. Changing demographics have produced increasing numbers of English deficient youth, prompting SDAs to offer more instruction in basic English skills, including English-As-A-Second Language programs. One SDA noted that they have always maintained a bilingual staff to service the large Hispanic population in the area.

---

[12] Eligibility requirements are documented in Policy Directive 90-21, dated June 20, 1990, Attachment A,
page 2.

Many SDAs determine the academic needs of the potential eligibility pool through discussions with the local school systems. This process is particularly relevant for those SDAs who plan to concentrate more money and resources on academic programs. Schools that operate academic remediation programs may give academic credit to those youth participants who have successfully completed the program and are enrolled (or will be enrolled that September) as students at that school. The opportunity to receive academic credit that was not achieved during the normal school year can function as an incentive for the youth to complete the programs.

In one particular SDA the needs of the eligible youth were addressed almost exclusively through work experience programs. In this SDA most of the IIB participants are enrolled in their schools' year-round JTPA IIA academic programs.[13] Since they participate in IIA-funded academic remediation during the regular school months, they prefer work experience as it is a change for them and serves as both a learning experience and an opportunity to earn money. This SDA had established a very valuable continuity of JTPA youth services throughout the year.

The local Private Industry Councils (PICs), called Regional Employment Boards (REBs) in Massachusetts, can play an influential role in the SYETP program menu. Under JTPA legislation, REBs have responsibility "to provide policy guidance for, and exercise oversight with respect to, activities under the job training plan for its service delivery area ..."[14] SDA officials work with REBs to establish goals for their IIB programs. REB-established program goals usually focus on high positive termination rates and academic improvement or credit, although REB priorities for IIB programs will vary by SDA. Some SDA officials described how their IIB programs' emphasis shifted from work experience to academics as a clear result of REB direction. In those SDAs the REBs wanted to communicate that the acquisition of basic learning skills was important to success in the workplace.

In 1992, retrenchment in employment also contributed to a slight shift away from certain work experience activities in many SDAs' SYETP. Due to the economic recession, SDAs that had concentrated on work experience for youth in prior summers had much more difficulty cultivating quality work experience vendors. Local public and non-profit employers who had drastically reduced their permanent workforce could

---

[13] JTPA IIA comprises year-round programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to afford job training to economically disadvantaged and other individuals facing serious barriers to employment.

[14] Title I, Part A, Section 103 (a) of the Job Training Partnership Act.

not justify using summer help. One SDA noted that unionized local agencies that otherwise were amenable to supervising a worksite began to view the IIB participants' work as an encroachment on the jobs of recently laid-off union members. However, widespread unemployment did not make work experience programs the exception. In fact, Massachusetts' Department of Employment and Training reported that work experience still comprised the majority of summer programs in 1992. Yet, it did produce an increase in outdoor, clean-up and maintenance work experience activities, versus work situated in a structured business environment.

The difficult economy strained the resources of the public schools as well as the local labor market. One SDA official reported that their public schools were so preoccupied with their own financial survival that they were unable to run IIB summer programs. In another SDA only one school had responded to the SDA's Request for Proposal, suggesting an unwillingness on the part of school administrators to invest the time, energy and staff in the IIB program. However, the flow of emergency funds effectively *increased* school involvement in a different SDA, where each of the five public high schools was now able to operate IIB programs. This allowed the SDA to assign youth participants to the specific school they would be attending in the fall.

Interviews with local SDA summer program directors and staff revealed different approaches to developing and managing the IIB summer programs. The process often reflected the particular interests and preferences of the staff. More than one SDA had contracted out almost its entire IIB delivery system to a single entity that was charged with executing all aspects of the planning, vendor selection, participant outreach, public awareness, implementation, administration and assessment of the programs. In most of the other service delivery areas the SDA staff directly administered the delivery and provision of the IIB programs themselves. Some SDA directors had been running the JTPA programs for several years and thus had developed relationships with repeat SYETP service providers. Their knowledge of the community's resources helped them in cultivating new summer programs. Higher community awareness of the summer youth programs also facilitated participant and employer outreach processes. Smaller SDAs could rely on "word-of-mouth" as a communication vehicle to build awareness of and familiarity with the IIB programs. In addition, directors of SDAs with smaller IIB participation levels (400-700 youth) were able to exercise more personal, "hands-on" involvement in developing and supporting the program vendors and staff. The smaller number of participants per program in these SDAs made it easier to integrate different age groups in individual programs. Age groupings had become more of an issue in 1992, as there was a noticeable increase in the number of 16-19 year old participants due to the severely constricted state and local labor markets.

The many variations in SYETP programs vividly illustrate the overall effects of regional and local influences at work. While many of the programs were situated at public schools (vocational and comprehensive) and public sector worksites, no two programs were exactly alike. The different service providers administering the programs, the teaching philosophies of the program staff, the role of the youth counselors, and the motivation and attitude of the youth participants together created unique program experiences. Furthermore, the total IIB program enrollment of each SDA ranged in size from under 400 enrollees to over 3500 enrollees, a reflection of the size of the SDA's IIB allocation and the total number of eligible youth. This one variable, the number of program participants, impacted the profile of IIB service providers and programs within each SDA. The SDAs with larger youth participation generally had a more diverse range of youth problems and needs to address, both in quantity and substance. Likewise, as a large SDA they usually had more service providers from which to choose. Their summer programs reflected this diversity in resources and populations. SDAs with small participation levels ordinarily did not have as many resources in their communities to access. However, as a given community often operated only one program, this simplified the participant placement process and the programs were flexible to accommodate different needs and priorities.

B. Selected Program Descriptions and Innovations

The economic and social realities of the SDA communities demanded local creativity in designing and implementing the JTPA summer programs. The site visits conducted for this report attest to the need for, and the results of, these localized efforts. We observed programs that were very effective in their community, some with elements that could be readily replicated in other regions. As a reflection of community resources, the urban, rural and suburban programs responded to their participants' needs in different ways.

It is important to view the summer programs from the perspective of the youth participants. The youths have substantial academic and skill needs. The social and economic conditions that made them eligible for JTPA IIB also meant that they carried a myriad of problems associated with their backgrounds. Many of the youths came from environments deprived of emotional support, financial stability, and career or school guidance. Together, these factors created an unusual and difficult set of pre-conditions that impacted participant expectations and performance.

The program descriptions that follow are based on our site visits and begin to illustrate how program quality is a complex product of personal relationships, community resources and institutions.

In an attempt to keep the program sites anonymous, the programs selected for description have been generically labeled Program A, B, C, etc.

Program A

Program A was situated in a busy urban teaching hospital. A group of 25-30 IIB youth participants was working in support positions in different hospital departments (such as the blood department, central transportation, housekeeping, the coffee shop). The participants chose which of the available departments they wanted to work in, and their supervisors assigned them very defined responsibilities and work shifts. The hospital staff served as on-site supervisors and mentors throughout the program duration. As this hospital had participated in the JTPA IIB program for over ten years, the hospital supervisors had clear and realistic expectations of the youth.

Each day the participants reported to their supervisors, as they would if this was their full-time job. Supervisors duly kept records of attendance, tardiness and absenteeism. They had developed a comfortable and supportive rapport with the youth, which added to the youths' self-esteem and confidence. The participants were assigned specific tasks, most of which were stimulating and challenging. One participant remarked, "I learn something new everyday." The youths were completely integrated into a professional and active employment setting, interacting with hospital staff everyday and experiencing the responsibilities and pressures of the hospital environment. The SDA provided counselors who worked with the participants to monitor their performance and to resolve problems.

This program was an invigorating experience that taught the role of employee responsibility and accountability. It provided its participants with a tangible sense of what it means to work in a professional and real work environment. Although not all of the participants expressed an interest in a healthcare career, they seemed to have developed an understanding of the importance of establishing a positive and stable employment history. Several of them had applied for year-round positions at the hospital, and the hospital had already hired a few for part-time employment in the fall.

Program B

Program B operated within a public high school and combined academic remediation with vocational exploration. Approximately forty youths participated in this computer literacy program, 90% of who were enrolled at the high school. The program director was a librarian at the school, and the assistant director was a science teacher.

At the beginning of the summer the program director divided the youths into two "mock companies," Data Entry and Newsletter. The Data Entry group used computer software to develop an entire computerized card catalog system for the library's books, magazines and periodicals. Most of their activity was the actual computer data entry of all library materials into this catalog system. The newsletter group performed the writing, editing and layout of a newsletter named "Teenage Times." They were planning to produce two issues during the summer, under the supervision of an art instructor on staff. The participants remained in their assigned "company" for the duration of the summer.

The program followed a highly structured and full daily schedule, which began at 7:30 a.m. and ended between 2:00 - 3:00 p.m. In the morning, the students signed in and

reported to a room called the "Union Hall" for announcements. The program directors had taught the participants how a workers' union operated and had instilled union procedures into the program environment. This included nominating and electing youth as "union officials" who had supervisory authority over the others. The program directors and students discussed and resolved problems, and voted upon program schedule changes in Union Hall meetings.

The morning activities began with thirty-five minutes each of math and English remediation, much of which was conducted through individual, self-paced computer instruction. A ten minute break followed academics, and then another short Union Meeting was held. The participants spent the rest of their morning in a half-hour reading period, computer database and worksite (company-related) organizational activities, tutorial sessions, and a half-hour "self-interest module" in which they could learn more about specific subjects such as graphics, video, maintenance or supplies.

The participants reported to the Union Hall again after lunch to review the morning's activities and afternoon work assignments. Next, they worked on Data Entry or the Newsletter for two hours. They reported to the Union Hall before the day was over, and some participants could request to work overtime for an additional hour (and additional money). The program directors had also organized two field trips during the summer, one to the Museum of Fine Arts and another to Canobie Lake, an amusement park.

The rigid but varied schedule of this program kept the youth engaged and stimulated. The program had achieved an effective balance between academic instruction and work experience. The program directors had creatively transformed a school setting into a place of employment for the youth.

Program C

Program C was unique due to its physical setting. The program was located on the waterfront campus of a postsecondary maritime institution, and the surroundings in themselves were quite an experience for the ninety participants. They were bused to the program site, a 40-mile trip, every day. The program combined academic remediation with an extensive variety of vocational activities, as well as lessons in fishing, sailing, CPR and water safety. It was staffed by faculty from the maritime institution and faculty from a vocational high school in the SDA. With an age range of 14 - 21 years old, the participants were grouped according to age levels.

The unusually high number of different activities offered during the program's eight weeks responded to the individual needs of the participants and ensured their interest was maintained throughout the summer. The day began at 9:00 a.m. and ended at 2:30 p.m. Every week the daily schedule changed, so that the youth could participate in as many shops and maritime activities as possible. Still, each day included at least two fifty-minute periods of academics (math, English, history, science, marine biology) and one period of life-skills workshops (e.g., substance abuse, AIDS counseling, problem solving). An example of a day's schedule is as follows:

9:00 - 9:50 a.m.	Electrical Safety (shop)
9:50 - 10:40 a.m.	Diesels (shop)
10:40 - 11:30 a.m.	Computers (lab)
11:30 - 12:00 noon	Lunch
12:00 - 12:50 p.m.	AIDS Counseling
12:50 - 1:40 p.m.	Math
1:40 - 2:30 p.m.	English

On certain days activities lasted two periods, to accommodate activities such as an excursion on a fishing vessel, machine shop and welding, or learning CPR and water safety. The hands-on approach of the vocational shops (e.g., engines repair, refrigeration, sea lab) motivated the participants, as they were able to handle and manipulate the large equipment. Many expressed curiosity about waterfront work and associated career possibilities to which they were being exposed for the first time.

The summer program was in its first year of operation. The SDA administrators acknowledged that the program's varied curriculum was the primary reason for its receipt of IIB funding. Indeed, the curriculum and schedule demonstrated extensive planning and thoughtfulness in its design by the program director and staff. Furthermore, a program staff member remarked that a goal for next summer would be to have even more electives in the shop experiences.

Program D

This program was an agricultural project made possible by a local corporation that donated six acres of its land for use during the summer. The SDA has been running this program as part of its SYETP for five years. Seventy to seventy-five participants spent eight weeks growing a variety of vegetables. They also grew flowers, which they

delivered to nursing homes every other week. Two afternoons each week they attended an area state college for academic remediation in math, reading and computer literacy. Occasional field trips were scheduled during the summer.

The participants learned agricultural skills from trained staff and through hands-on experience growing vegetables in their own plots of land. The first week of the program focused on preparing the land, allocating produce areas and seeding. From 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. each day (except for the two afternoons at the state college) the participants became "farmers," experiencing the constant and somewhat tedious work required to yield a healthy crop of vegetables. They took two twenty minute breaks and an hour for lunch. Over 50% of the participants were 14 and 15 years old and for many of them this program represented their first summer job. They grew green beans, zucchini, carrots, squash, corn-on-the-cob, tomatoes and much more. The program staff donated the vegetables to homeless shelters, soup kitchens, and disadvantaged families in the SDA. The participants were able to bring surplus produce home. Unfortunately, the youths were not personally involved in the charitable donations.

Participants who were interviewed expressed varying degrees of satisfaction with this type of work. However, the farming experience encouraged teamwork, social interaction, and, for most, provided a sense of accomplishment.

Program E

Program E was a very small program, with ten participants, run by a high school in a rural community. It consisted of classroom academics and work experience projects to improve the physical interior and exterior of the school. Two of the participants had already graduated from the high school and the other eight were enrolled students. The program directors were a physics teacher and a math teacher at the school.

During the mornings, from 7:30 a.m. to noon, the youth performed different indoor and outdoor maintenance projects at the school. They washed windows, cleaned floors, repaired light fixtures, painted and removed gum from the bottom of auditorium seats. They also learned landscaping techniques and were very proud of a small park area they had built on the school's front lawn as a memorial to the recently deceased school principal.

The academic part of the summer program consisted of two courses that were part of a new tech prep curriculum the high school was developing. The tech prep curriculum, scheduled to be implemented in the fall, would involve two years of study at the high school and two years at a nearby community college. It would lead to the attainment of an associate degree or two-year certificate. For the first half of the eight week summer program the youth attended an applied mathematics course in the afternoon (12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.), taught by the math teacher. For the next four weeks the afternoon classes switched to a Principles of Technology course, incorporating applied science classroom sessions and labs and taught by the physics teacher. The teachers valued the opportunity to test out the new curriculum, even though none of these youths were scheduled to participate in the tech-prep program in the fall. The IIB participants either had not enrolled in the tech-prep program or were two young to qualify.

The participants were paid $4.25/hour and they were eligible for a 50-cent raise halfway through the program. The program directors described how this financial incentive noticeably motivated the participants to work harder. However, they also explained the difficult choices they had to make, as their funding allowed raises for only half of the participants.

Other Notable Program Features

Some of the summer programs we visited contained a specific feature or activity that represented a unique approach to teaching certain skills and principles to the youth. Rather than fully documenting these programs, this section will isolate and highlight the innovative features of each.

1.) In a program situated at a regional vocational high school, the staff had developed a very effective approach to teaching job acquisition skills. It was part of one summer-long project entitled "Getting A Job," in which two teachers simulated a company and led the youth through the entire hiring process. Importantly, the teachers had carefully designed a very realistic and educational model, using an actual application form from a potential employer (with the actual employer name removed from the form). They closely supervised the youth as they wrote resumes, filled out applications, and interviewed for the job. "Mock" interviews were conducted in a very realistic role-playing manner, and the teachers commented that they were surprised at how serious the whole activity had become, both to themselves and to the students. This process was followed by performance

assessments and youth who were not "hired" were given feedback as to skills that needed improvement.

The "Getting A Job" project offers an example of an extremely valuable and relevant exercise for 14-21 year olds. The youth themselves expressed how much they enjoyed and learned from it. The dedication and creativity of the program staff in designing such projects demonstrates the impact a high quality program staff can have on a summer youth program.

2.) Many of the JTPA IIB summer programs incorporated vocational shop activities and/or work crews. One program we visited demonstrated how these two activities could be meaningfully connected to the neighboring community, thereby enhancing the participants' learning experience. This program operated out of a high school in a largely rural area. The community-based nature of its work crew projects extended beyond the more commonly found clean-up tasks. Work crew projects included not only improvement of the school's grounds, but also the local senior center. In addition, the youth built very impressive furniture in the carpentry shop that was donated to the senior center and other community organizations. It was evident at our site visit that the youths were quite proud of the furniture pieces they had produced in shop. Having a tangible, physical product as a result of their newly acquired skills augmented their sense of personal accomplishment. At most school-based IIB programs that included shop, the youth made something for themselves to take home. This program helped to teach how satisfying it can be to give something to others in need.

3.) A regional vocational high school received IIB funding to design and implement a summer program that was specifically targeted to their incoming freshman students. The 65 participants were pre-tested and shown to be deficient in math, language and reading skills. This summer program combined academic remediation with vocational shops, and its goal was to provide academic support to incoming freshmen so that they would be better prepared and capable of handling their academic course load in the upcoming school year. The youth attended the six week program from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. each day, with four periods of classroom academics and two periods of shop. They could choose two out of four shop activities -- auto body, machine technology, computer programming and graphic communications.

The structure of this program ensured continuity between a summer learning experience and the school year. The participants were utilizing the same facilities

that they would be using in the fall, they were taught by the school's year-round faculty, and they became familiar with the school's resources. This early introduction to the school was expected to benefit their freshman year performance.

IV. FINDINGS

A. SYETP AS A SUPPLEMENTAL LEARNING PROGRAM

By definition, a supplement is "something that compensates for a deficiency or constitutes an addition."[15] JTPA IIB can be considered a supplemental learning program in its efforts to address the many needs of the participants by adding a new learning experience onto the normal school year. While operating as a stand-alone, short term measure, IIB programs can serve a very valuable function in giving at-risk youth additional opportunities for success. They can provide youth with unique learning experiences and new settings in which to excel. The dynamics of the summer programs illustrate the principle that all youths do not learn in the same way. Many of the participants, who had felt like failures at school, gained self-esteem and confidence from discovering that not only can they learn useful skills, but that they can also enjoy the learning process.

A cornerstone of the summer programs was their ability to create a positive atmosphere that encouraged achievement. Unconventional learning environments were the rule, not the exception. The caring nature of the program staff, access to counselors, low participant-to-staff ratios and attainable goals improved participant attitudes and strengthened staff/participant relationships. The youths were given the opportunity to work closely with people who were caring and personally interested in them. Together, these features made learning a feasible goal rather than a difficult and overwhelming process.

The increased participant-to-staff ratios were immediately apparent in our site visits. In most programs we visited the ratio ranged between 6:1 and 15:1. The importance of the individual attention that the participants received should not be underestimated. The needs and problems of disadvantaged and troubled youth often get lost in the large classrooms typical of today's schools. In the small learning groups of the IIB programs most youth could not avoid receiving a healthy amount of personal, and positive, attention. Many staff members of different SDAs attributed the academic gains of participants to this one-on-one attention and interaction.

---

[15] Webster's II New Riverside Dictionary, © 1984, Houghton Mifflin Company

The effectiveness of non-traditional classroom activities was also noteworthy in stimulating learning and an actual interest in academics. The instructors used creative means of presenting academic subjects, eschewing the standard textbook, lecture and memorization exercises. Examples included a chalkboard football game, fraction hockey and math baseball where scoring was based on correctly answering math questions. Programs often utilized computer software to provide visual stimulation and self-paced learning. By adopting these positive and interactive approaches to teaching, the staff were able to regularly retain the attention of the participants, the same youth whom had much difficulty paying attention during the normal school year.

The vocational shop activities of many of the school-based summer programs provided an active and meaningful way to teach why it was necessary to improve academic skills. By demonstrating how academic principles related to vocational skills, the participants better understood the constant emphasis on academics. In our site visits we observed participants actively engaged in welding, automotive, metal fabrication and culinary shops. It was surprising how little the youths noticed our presence due to their being so intent on pursuing their work. The shops also featured the benefit of giving the participants a tangible product of their efforts. This strengthened their self-esteem and their own sense of capability. One vocational instructor remarked, "I see kids excelling (in shop) who aren't doing well in the other parts of their life ... they seem to have found a niche."

Another component unique to the JTPA IIB experience can be found in the work ethic that was carefully and strategically woven into the programs. The staff made concerted efforts to have the youth approach their participation as if it was a job. The youth often had to "punch in" and "punch out" at the start and end of the day, or fill out time sheets. Attendance was not mandatory, but rather was based on individual responsibility. However, hours or days missed translated into lost earnings and sometimes failure to accumulate academic credit. For better or worse, the incentive of getting paid could be used to ensure appropriate behavior and to administer discipline. Some administrators who could compare the behavior and performance of their participants during the summer program versus the normal school year noted a marked improvement.

More importantly, the IIB programs could potentially play a valuable role in filling a "gap" of knowledge among youth concerning the demands of the workplace and career awareness. The programs required many of the same basic competencies that are needed for the workplace, such as commitment to assigned tasks, regular attendance, punctuality and the ability to work in a group. Many of the IIB participants came from

economically and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds where job skills were not taught, not even the basic knowledge of how to find and hold a job. The work experience activities of the SYETP helped the participants understand the work environment and the performance expectations of an employee. Hopefully some of the youth were learning a more implicit lesson, that with hard work one can become self-sufficient and escape poverty and a dependence on welfare.

B. INTANGIBLE BENEFITS

The JTPA IIB programs are charged with meeting the three goals of the JTPA legislation, along with the goals and objectives outlined by the SDA and the performance indicators of the state Department of Employment and Training. These standards are fairly broad in scope and reflect results that can be measured. Yet, they lack a very important category of benefits, those related to adolescent and personal development. In his paper, *Effective Strategies for Investing in Youth*, Earl El-Amin identifies specific basic adolescent needs which he insists must be met, including "a need to belong, a need for recognition, a need for validation, and a need to establish a sense of purpose/importance/achievement."[16] El-Amin explains that when these basic needs are not fulfilled, adolescents lack the motivation that should be directed toward education or preparation for the world of work. Many of the intangible benefits of the summer programs address these personal developmental needs. However, such advances toward the social re-integration of at-risk youth cannot be measured with any sort of competency test.

One SDA program supervisor defined a successful participant experience as demonstrating a good attitude, social interaction, positive overall performance, and other "intangibles." Most of the interviewed staff described achievement in terms of self-esteem, self-confidence, teamwork, and a sense of personal accomplishment. Other benefits included an increased awareness of different academic paths (such as vocational education) and the skills required for employment. Additionally, attendance was an issue for many of the participants. Some had developed very poor attendance habits at school and were not used to being required to follow a schedule or to commit themselves to a program. To understand the need for regular attendance was viewed as a significant accomplishment in itself.

---

[16] An abstract of his paper appeared in *Investing in Youth, A Compilation of Recommended Policies and Practices*. National Governors Association National Conference. December 9 - 11, 1992.

It would seem an unfair and inadequate practice to evaluate the IIB programs only by pre- and post- testing scores and the number of "positive terminations." Documenting and reporting more information on personal development and intangible benefits would illuminate other critical areas of positive outcomes. When basic adolescent needs are fulfilled, they become tantamount to "non-credentialed" competencies which are equally important to continued academic and vocational training.

These summer programs also address a societal need that has become increasingly visible in relation to the socialization and economic conditions of today's youth. The programs hold an important social value in their ability to keep youth busy, off the streets, earning money and being productive during the summer months. The structure and focus of the IIB programs offer a much needed community resource for social interaction, vigorous activity, income and the opportunity to learn something new and different from the normal school year. For many youths the summer can otherwise be a time for not only learning loss, but also turning to potentially harmful activities because of boredom, loneliness or the desire to make money. Thus in addressing the personal and developmental needs of youth, the summer programs can simultaneously satisfy certain social needs of the larger community. While not explicitly stated in federal, state or local JTPA objectives, this points to an implicit but significant benefit of the short-term IIB experience.

C. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS OF A SUMMER PROGRAM

Because the JTPA IIB programs are limited to the summer months, their short-term duration inevitably limits what they can achieve. The programs typically last six to seven weeks. The summer of 1992 was an exception, as the SDAs used the emergency funds to extend most programs to eight or ten weeks. Still, given this brief period of opportunity, what can the programs realistically accomplish? Will skill improvements, attitudinal changes and academic advances last? IIB Program administrators and teachers are faced with many challenges in their efforts to create learning experiences with tangible and prolonged results.

The challenges begin months before the summer programs actually start. When asked what was the biggest obstacle in planning and administering the IIB programs, many staff members cited the procurement process for service providers and the eligibility verification process for potential participants. In order to comply with federal law and state guidelines, the IIB program SDA staff must follow strict guidelines for procurement and eligibility. Personnel from the Department of Labor monitor the

SDAs and their vendors to evaluate compliance. One SDA staff member stated that he would not allow participation to a youth who had failed to provide documentation of only one of the many eligibility requirements, rather than face the risk of the DOL monitors identifying this error. If a participant is deemed ineligible, the SDA must pay back to the government the cost of the youth's participation.

The recessionary labor market of the late 1980's and early 1990's presented an additional challenge to the planning of IIB programs. JTPA limits IIB funded work experience activities to non-profit public and private organizations. When such organizations are forced to reduce their own full-time workforce, they are less likely to accept youth as summer employees. The economic conditions made it more difficult to find productive, meaningful work for the youth. In some instances, the participants were given unappealing work projects which full-time employees did not want to perform. Such jobs would be more appropriate if they were coupled with other activities offering a positive and educational experience.

In addition to the difficulties associated with service provider recruitment, there is the issue of hiring qualified teachers and/or supervisors for the different summer programs. As explained earlier in this report, the quality of the staff had a direct relation to the quality of the program experience. In many of the programs, SDAs hired full-time teachers from the area school systems for school-based programs. These teachers had extensive training and experience as educators, usually at the secondary level, and were thus likely to be effective in teaching academic subjects and developing a comfortable and productive relationship with the youth. However, in general, summer program teachers and supervisors reported that they only received between half a day and one full day of training for the summer program. This may be sufficient for those staff members who are experienced secondary teachers, but it raises a concern for those staff members who have had little formal supervisory or teaching experience with fourteen to twenty-one year olds. One day cannot provide enough time to train someone in teaching techniques as well as how to respond to the emotional and intellectual needs of the IIB participants. Program staff development is a challenge that can and should be overcome. Time is too short, and the participant needs are too important, not to devote the necessary resources to developing quality staff.

Another limitation of the summer programs is their ability to evaluate their own success, or failures. Currently, the SDAs, REBs and DET primarily use pre- and post-test scores of participants for evaluative purposes. The SDAs collect this data and report it to the appropriate authorities. However, the information is then simply filed away without any plan for future use at the local level. Some SDA administrators

APPENDIX 2

JTPA TITLE IIB - TRENDS IN FUNDING - 1984-1992

SDA	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
BERKSHIRE	$ 598,224	$ 572,719	$ 528,638	$ 423,776	$ 403,567	$ 330,883
BOSTON	$ 3,023,999	$ 2,895,070	$ 2,672,245	$ 1,785,823	$ 1,786,277	$ 1,427,561
BRISTOL	$ 1,217,333	$ 1,251,280	$ 1,486,145	$ 1,536,693	$ 1,651,412	$ 1,345,485
BROCKTON	$ 690,407	$ 660,971	$ 610,098	$ 407,786	$ 452,786	$ 343,359
FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE	$ 739,240	$ 707,722	$ 653,251	$ 436,558	$ 436,669	$ 348,978
HAMPDEN	$ 1,550,814	$ 1,486,558	$ 1,373,142	$ 916,983	$ 917,216	$ 733,023
LOWER MERRIMACK	$ 967,510	$ 926,260	$ 854,968	$ 625,314	$ 959,645	$ 1,021,504
METRO NORTH	$ 2,484,126	$ 2,378,215	$ 2,195,215	$ 1,467,002	$ 1,467,375	$ 1,172,699
METRO SOUTH/WEST	$ 1,810,769	$ 1,733,566	$ 1,600,138	$ 1,069,350	$ 1,069,622	$ 854,822
NEW BEDFORD/ CAPE*	$ 1,520,578	$ 1,521,130	$ 1,628,163	$ 1,592,447	$ 1,838,427	$ 1,700,619
NORTHERN MIDDLESEX	$ 740,254	$ 708,693	$ 654,147	$ 437,157	$ 462,353	$ 359,183
NORTH CENTRAL	$ 683,671	$ 654,522	$ 604,145	$ 403,742	$ 491,510	$ 356,737
SOUTH COASTAL	$ 1,385,289	$ 1,326,227	$ 1,224,151	$ 818,083	$ 818,291	$ 653,963
NORTH SHORE	$ 1,274,231	$ 1,219,904	$ 1,126,011	$ 752,497	$ 752,689	$ 1,048,704
WORCESTER	$ 1,581,194	$ 1,513,779	$ 1,397,268	$ 933,774	$ 934,012	$ 746,445
STATE TOTAL	**$20,267,639**	**$19,556,612**	**$18,606,681**	**$13,606,919**	**$14,441,851**	**$12,443,965**

* Until 1992, the Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket area was combined with the New Bedford SDA. Therefore, all funds for the Cape and the Islands were included in the New Bedford SDA's total allocation from 1984 through 1991. In 1992, the Governor designated Cape Cod and the Islands as a separate service delivery area. Thus, 1992 allocations reflect funds distributed separately to the New Bedford SDA and the Cape Cod SDA.

Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training

JTPA TITLE IIB - TRENDS IN FUNDING - 1984-1992
(cont'd.)

SDA	1990	1991	1992
BERKSHIRE	$ 418,694	$ 359,109	$ 617,104
BOSTON	$ 1,187,104	$ 1,281,648	$ 2,193,694
BRISTOL	$ 1,152,902	$ 1,182,583	$ 1,841,063
BROCKTON	$ 427,904	$ 520,089	$ 820,072
FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE	$ 290,197	$ 305,862	$ 645,807
HAMPDEN	$ 763,826	$ 901,488	$ 1,449,478
LOWER MERRIMACK	$ 896,166	$ 907,679	$ 1,422,826
METRO NORTH	$ 975,171	$ 1,015,412	$ 1,890,267
METRO SOUTHWEST	$ 710,837	$ 740,508	$ 1,445,378
NEW BEDFORD	$ 1,492,317	$ 1,513,212	$ 1,338,079
NORTHERN MIDDLESEX	$ 473,115	$ 637,728	$ 871,327
NORTH CENTRAL	$ 371,975	$ 506,468	$ 756,517
SOUTH COASTAL	$ 543,811	$ 663,733	$ 1,340,818
NORTH SHORE	$ 740,433	$ 842,049	$ 1,246,510
WORCESTER	$ 620,715	$ 1,005,505	$ 1,588,890
CAPE COD & ISLANDS*	N/A	N/A	$ 1,033,981
STATE TOTAL	**$11,065,167**	**$12,383,073**	**$20,501,811**

* Until 1992, the Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket area was combined with the New Bedford SDA. Therefore, all funds for the Cape and the Islands were included in the New Bedford SDA's total allocation from 1984 through 1991. In 1992, the Governor designated Cape Cod and the Islands as a separate service delivery area. Thus, 1992 allocations reflect funds distributed separately to the New Bedford SDA and the Cape Cod SDA.

Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training

APPENDIX 3

JTPA TITLE IIB SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLMENT LEVELS: 1984-1992

SDA	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
BERKSHIRE	537	498	497	232	224	218	232	207	495
BOSTON	3,583	3,931	3,376	1,916	1,879	1,239	1,127	1,099	3,543
BRISTOL	1,259	1,228	1,247	1,145	1,121	1,223	841	894	1,912
BROCKTON	593	517	461	365	304	332	362	405	663
FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE	763	671	620	405	380	296	236	194	521
HAMPDEN	1,884	1,802	1,548	1,033	638	698	730	670	1,425
LOWER MERRIMACK	730	864	794	530	717	794	801	784	1,254
METRO NORTH	1,676	1,496	1,287	1,027	841	823	653	721	1,796
METRO SOUTHWEST	684	699	881	619	701	702	549	563	874
NEW BEDFORD	1,293	1,345	1,297	970	772	710	671	674	953
NORTHERN MIDDLESEX	791	733	632	390	327	324	278	414	953
NORTH CENTRAL	545	448	386	319	336	316	381	411	774
SOUTH COASTAL	907	920	868	585	509	380	290	343	1,011
NORTH SHORE	962	941	912	666	492	594	364	356	793
WORCESTER	1,387	1,205	994	866	723	573	475	839	1,561
CAPE COD & ISLANDS*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	373
TOTAL	**17,594**	**17,298**	**15,800**	**11,068**	**9,964**	**9,222**	**7,990**	**8,574**	**18,901**

* Until 1992, the Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket area was combined with the New Bedford SDA. Therefore, IIB enrollment for the Cape and the Islands was included in the New Bedford SDA's total enrollment from 1984 through 1991. In 1992, the Governor designated Cape Cod and the Islands as a separate service delivery area. Thus, 1992 IIB enrollment data reflects the separation of the New Bedford and the Cape Cod SDAs.

Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training

APPENDIX 4

JTPA IIB INTERVIEW INSTRUMENTS

I. Questions for SDA Director/Summer Coordinator

A. Program Development/Planning

- What are your goals for your 1992 SYETP?
- What are the major barriers to program implementation (past/present)?
- Is there any connection between the SYETP and the year-round JTPA programs? Year-round school curriculum?
- How many service providers is your SDA working with?
- Explain the service provider recruitment/procurement process.
- Describe the youth recruitment, application, eligibility review, enrollment process. Is there a gap between the eligibility pool and actual number of youth served?
- How difficult is it to place youth in "good" jobs? i.e. jobs which develop skills and good work habits.
- How are program placement decisions made for the youth participating?

B. Budget/Costs

- How did you allocate the emergency funds allotted to your SDA?
- Is it more expensive to provide work experience or educational enrichment programs?
- How are expenditures categorized?

C. Staff

- How is the summer staff recruited?
- Explain the training and functions of program supervisors, counselors and other support personnel.
- To what extent do you interact with the support staff during the program period?

D. Program Content/Outcomes

- Has the distribution among program types changed significantly over time? (work experience, academic remediation, vocational)
- What is the rationale for the current program distribution?
- How are quality outcomes determined for work/academic/vocational experience? Or, how would you define a successful program experience?
- How is the academic curriculum designed?
- Does pre- and post-testing provide meaningful data? How is this data used?
- Do the youth receive any academic credit?
- Is educational software being used in any of the programs?
- How many weeks do your programs last?
- How many hours per week do the youth participate?
- What are your future goals for your SDA's summer youth programs?

II. Questions for Program Supervisors

- How were you trained for your position? What are your official duties/responsibilities?
- Are you employed by the SDA or the school/employer?
- What kind of performance standards do you use in evaluating the youth?
- How would you define a successful work experience? a successful academic experience?
- How do you help to enrich the experience for the kids? How are the youth motivated to attend the program, to learn, to participate?
- What kind of interaction do you have with the SDA Director and other staff?
- How many hours per week do the youth participate?
- Do discipline problems exist? How are they handled?

suggested that the information could serve as a future employment reference for participants. Still, the information is not shared with school guidance counselors, teachers or parents, unless specifically requested. Staff members deferred to the issues of "privacy" and "confidentiality" regarding the exchange of such information. But this only adds further importance to the question of why the data is collected and for what purpose. Furthermore, do these pre-and post- academic test scores accurately reflect participant performance? And can test scores be used as a legitimate barometer of how innovative, creative and successful the summer programs are?

Some of the summer programs have incorporated written performance "profile" evaluations so that supervisors could more fully document the personal development and achievements of the participants.[17] While not as extensive as the student performance profiles being introduced in today's schools, they serve a similar function. Many of the advances made during the summer months reflect "intangible" competencies. Program supervisors feel unfairly pressured to provide tangible evidence of progress when perhaps the youths make the most progress in areas that cannot be tested or quantified. Many of the supervisors are well aware of how the participants performed without consideration of post- test scores. An innovative practice adopted by at least one SDA was to review and complete the written performance evaluation *together* with the participant.

The file information collected for the IIB participants remains separate from their full-time student records. The most critical limitation of current JTPA summer programs is that they operate in a "vacuum," as a stand-alone, self-contained youth program with only occasional links to the rest of the school year. This can have serious implications in assessing the long-term results of overall program quality and individual participant achievement. When participant progress is made during the summer program, whether the progress is academic, psychological or skill-related, these short-term accomplishments are not pursued and reinforced by other educators or mentors after the program ends. This sharp break with the summer experience can subtract from the advances that had been made. It can also be difficult for the participants to abruptly end the close personal relationships they may have developed with their teacher, supervisor or mentor, relationships that may have given them the motivation to learn.

One program in particular (referred to earlier) illustrated the potential benefits of establishing a connection with the regular school year. A vocational high school had created a IIB program specifically for incoming freshmen, who school administrators

[17] Two such performance evaluation forms are included in the Appendix.

had identified as deficient in certain academic areas. During the summer they received academic instruction from the school's year-round faculty and became familiar with the school's facilities and resources. This program helped the youth prepare academically for their freshman year and assured that their summer performance would be recognized, continued and built upon by their year-round teachers and counselor.

In our interviews with SDA directors and staff, many responded to the concept of a link between the summer program and year-round schooling with hesitancy and uncertainty. The schools and the SDAs seemed to have never seriously discussed this idea. Some of the personnel were positive about developing this linkage, but a greater number viewed it as unworkable and impractical. If significant gains *are* made during the summer, without continued reinforcement of this progress during the school year what truly has been accomplished? The JTPA IIB program administrators and public school personnel need to explore this question.

Almost all of the SDAs operated school-based JTPA IIB programs, located in both secondary and postsecondary schools. The emergency funding enabled additional schools to participate as IIB service providers in 1992. This strengthens the rationale for linkages and elevates the issue of why linkages between summer and year-round programs have been so rarely developed. For school-based programs that award academic credit to program completers, there already exists a channel of communication between the program administrators and year-round schools. This link could be expanded to communicate other achievements from the summer. Is it the widespread concern over confidentiality that hinders the potential exchange of information, or is a better explanation the lack of financial and human resources? Regardless, this connection may provide the necessary link to begin the development of a more comprehensive strategy of addressing the needs of at-risk youth. In general, the most successful youth programs are extraordinarily comprehensive in nature. Linking all available resources and institutions can provide the foundation for this success.

D. MEETING THE GOALS OF JTPA . . .

It would be appropriate to revisit the three goals of the JTPA legislation to consider the extent to which they are being fulfilled. The results vary by SDA. The regional resources, employment conditions and academic needs of each SDA influence which purpose(s) receive the most interest and emphasis. In some SDAs over 85% of the summer programs are work-related, addressing the third purpose of the law; in other SDAs the majority of the programs focus on academic remediation, addressing the first

purpose of the law; still other SDAs have implemented programs with a balanced mix of instruction that begin to incorporate all three purposes of the law. Acknowledging that these goals do not address some of the areas of personal development, they do set important standards and they are mandated by federal law.

GOAL #1: To Enhance the Basic Educational Skills of Youth

The SDAs have received increasing demands from the REBs and the Department of Labor to incorporate a greater emphasis on academics in the JTPA IIB programs. As a result, more summer programs include a significant academic component, which helps to improve basic educational skills. The academic settings and exercises are structured very differently from those found in the normal school year, and this has positively affected the participants' attitudes toward school and learning. However, if the pre- and post- test scores are used as the principal tool for measuring academic performance, the results are not as encouraging.

Most of the SDAs aim only to maintain, not increase, the test scores. The 1992 End-of-Year Report of one SDA explains, "It has been learned that only infrequently can we increase the academic skills of our youth during even the most intensive remediation sessions during the summer, but it is perhaps almost as heartening to learn that we can stem summer learning loss and peak the interest of many of these youth by using interesting and innovative methods to get them to read, write and calculate." Such efforts to prevent summer learning loss provide the most common interpretation of this legislated goal. It demonstrates an interesting dynamic at work in the summer programs -- while the programs set high expectations for responsible behavior and appropriate attitudes, the academic standards are measured against a more moderate scale of achievement.

Certain summer programs, especially those focusing on work experience, included very little academic instruction. Academic skills were indirectly applied to certain tasks, but the goal of these programs appeared to be focused on teaching employment-related skills to prepare the youth for life after school. One instructor remarked, "Let's be realistic, a lot of these kids won't finish school. They better be prepared to earn enough to eat." Work experience-only programs emphasized the importance of being employed, without offering as much opportunity for the youth to improve their academic skills.

GOAL #2: To Encourage School Completion, or Enrollment in Supplementary or Alternative Programs

Some summer programs attempted to address this objective directly, through a formal seminar focusing on the importance of staying in school. However, a limited effort such as this might not provide a lasting message to the participants. It was more common for the summer programs to try to fulfill this goal through indirect means. Subtle and continuous efforts to convey the importance of staying in school were effectively incorporated into school-based programs, programs combining work experience with vocational/classroom training, and smaller, localized programs.

Programs physically situated in schools reinforced the resources and potential benefits of schools simply by the nature of their location. They helped the participants feel more comfortable with school surroundings and with teachers. Programs combining work experience and classroom activities provided the participants with a clear rationale for continuing their academic learning. They showed the dependent relationship between academic success and workplace success. For some of the participants, the IIB program served as their first exposure to vocational schools. Program staff remarked on the participants' enthusiasm in shop activities and renewed interest in learning. In a few instances participants requested to transfer into the vocational school in the fall. This clearly fulfilled the goal of encouraging enrollment in alternative educational programs.

The smaller programs (in less populated SDAs) often had better opportunities to prevent dropping out because the staff either were from the participant's year-round school or were in close contact with that school. Therefore, the IIB staff would more likely forward information regarding potential drop-out candidates to the appropriate school administrator in the fall. In contrast, it was often very difficult to track the participants in the larger IIB programs to anticipate their returning to school. This again raises the issue of the lack of any systematic follow-up to the summer programs. A follow-up system, while adding responsibility and requiring financial support, could better encourage school retention and completion. The current counseling services available during the IIB programs are, like the programs themselves, self-contained, so that at the end of the summer they cease to play a role. We talked to the summer staff about creating a liaison position between the SDA and local school guidance counselors and the idea received mixed reviews. Although it might be difficult to implement, this type of linkage could prove to be a very worthwhile investment.

GOAL #3: To Provide Eligible Youth with Exposure to the World of Work

This may be considered the most successful part of the JTPA IIB programs. Almost all of the programs that were visited or reviewed in research made a substantial effort to teach the participants the value of employment and the role of an employee. The participants who were assigned to a professional work organization (e.g., hospital, library, city hall) benefited from the opportunity to observe and experience the realities of employment first-hand. However, even in the school-based and academic-focused programs, the participants were taught to view their program participation as a job. During the summer the youth learned how to write a resume, how to look for a job, the importance of regular attendance, and appropriate workplace behavior. Such behavior standards were instilled in all of the different types of programs, and misbehavior was effectively reprimanded with a loss in pay.

The participants began to understand that they would eventually need a job to meet their own economic needs. Some of them learned specific employment skills, such as welding, carpentry and cooking. While they may not use such skills as employees in the future, they gained confidence from realizing that they could in fact be a productive member of the workforce. This had a short-term benefit of building satisfaction and confidence in oneself, and hopefully a longer term benefit of a new awareness of what is needed to become employed and to stay employed. From basic behavior and attitude requirements to particular vocational skills, the participants received an early and much needed introduction to the world of work.

V. CONCLUSION

After visiting one of the many JTPA IIB summer programs, a local journalist remarked, "Education, responsibility, work experience, spare money, skills, hopefully (these are) enough to teach students that there are better things to do than waste time on the streets...enough to give students more of a hope for a future."[18] This comment very succinctly captures the potential value of JTPA IIB as a stand-alone, short term program. It can provide participants with a sense of personal structure and meaning as well as a source of positive activity and social interaction during the summer months. Considering the difficult educational and social needs that these programs attempt to address, these are important outcome objectives.

Overall, our analysis of JTPA IIB reveals that no standard formula exists for planning and operating a successful program — whether stand-alone or linked to year-round services. To a large extent this is desirable in that distinctive local responses to local needs should have priority. However, common elements did emerge as being especially effective in making a substantial difference in the quality of the summer experience. The most notable of these elements are a dedicated and creative staff, small supervisor-to-participant ratios, and confidence building activities.

To develop a coherent system of successful JTPA IIB programs in Massachusetts that can consistently teach and train at-risk youths, *we should begin with what is working at the local level; examining the characteristics, components, and overall design of effective programs*. This should be followed by a new dialogue among a broad group of administrators and policy makers aimed at identifying and sharing the best practices through which JTPA IIB can serve eligible youth across the state. While responding to local needs must remain a priority, a comprehensive approach that meets objectives supported by all of the SDAs can inform, unify, and guide regional efforts.

Furthermore, we believe that in order to realize the full potential of IIB, connections between the summer experiences and year-round education and training programs should be explored. While it is understood that the JTPA legislation does not explicitly require such a connection, it is clear that JTPA IIB is intended to provide youth with bridges to continued learning and personal growth. Why else would emphasis be given to maintaining and improving basic skills, encouraging school continuation, and

---

[18]Willis, J. *Athol Daily News*. August 8, 1992. Page 12.

providing work place skills with earned income, in order to instill a sense of self-worth for future endeavors?

Title IIB could have an exponentially greater impact if SDAs, using models devised to suit each particular service area, required all summer programs to be linked to year-round services. As noted, there certainly is value in a distinct summer program that differs from the regular school year experience. However, this "separate" experience should be viewed as a building block and not a stop gap intervention. It should be pointed out that this study references certain programs that do contain linkage components as part of their design. The thinking behind these programs, and the models that they provide, should be used as resources upon which to build.

It is the hope of the Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education that this report will increase the awareness and understanding of JTPA IIB summer programs in the Commonwealth. These programs provide a valuable opportunity for reintegrating at-risk youth into the educational process as well as retaining students whose educational status and sense of personal well-being are marginal.

Finally, much of the Council's current work is focusing on the "forgotten" 75% of students who will not obtain a baccalaureate degree. These students, the majority of who will enter the secondary labor market with few of the skills needed to advance to high wage employment, are increasingly among those eligible for JTPA IIB summer programs. Research and experience strongly indicate the need to intervene early in the lives of these youths, to provide different entry and exit points to facilitate their educational experience, and to expose them early and often to different careers, including the actual workplace in which they occur. This report directly relates to this issue. Exploring the world of the JTPA IIB "system" is intended to contribute to the seamless and expansive continuum of learning that students need.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

J.T.P.A. IIB is currently a thirty-three million dollar program servicing more than 18,000 youth statewide in the two months of June and July. The Council offers the following recommendations to refine and enhance the quality of this valuable program. The recommendations address JTPA IIB on two different levels. The first level of recommendations concerns IIB's legislated functions as a specific summer youth program. The second level refers to IIB's potential in linking its summer programs with year-round education and training systems.

After much deliberation we have decided to limit ourselves to a total of six recommendations. We believe that they are of considerable import and trust that our focus on a few key issues will result in their being given serious consideration by policy makers and program administrators.

I. JTPA IIB as a Summer Program

The Council recommends:

1. **To ensure the highest quality programs and services, summer program instructors and counselors should be carefully selected and receive intensive training. Selection and training should reflect the need for a thorough understanding of the clientele to be served.**

   The key to any successful learning experience is the quality of interaction between teacher and student. The most dynamic programs observed or described for this study were notable for the instructional skills and personal interest in students demonstrated by staff. Currently, training time and training materials for summer staff are quite limited. As a result, the desired quality of instruction and guidance becomes too dependent on the chance that staff already possess the skills necessary for these unique summer programs.

   We believe that funds for staff recruitment and development are an essential investment in meeting the desired goal of uniformly superior programs.

2. **All SDA Directors and appropriate staff should convene as a group in late winter for a joint II B planning session to share information on management procedures and best practices. A similar session should be held in the fall for a joint review of the preceding summer's activities. Service providers should be included in the fall session.**

   There is much to be learned across SDAs and in the broader education, training and employment system relative to summer program innovation and improvement. Currently, we find little evidence of regional information sharing for these purposes.

   These recommended joint sessions would not compromise the need to respond to the unique local characteristics and demands of each region. Indeed it is a loss to both individual regions and the whole system when SDAs fail to communicate with each other regarding their successes and failures. We were struck by the number of thoughtful and exciting programs that are apparently never disseminated for consideration by other SDAs. Furthermore, the inclusion of each SDA's service providers in the fall session would provide valuable program information. More importantly, service providers and summer staff might learn about successful programs that they would be willing to initiate for their own SDA.

3. **Systems for reporting JTPA IIB outcomes and compiling End-of-Year Program reports should be improved. While many JTPA IIB reporting requirements are federally mandated, SDAs or REBs should initiate a process with DET to improve state-level reporting procedures. This process should be the responsibility of the regions to ensure that local differences are comprehended. It should, however, contain sufficient common elements to allow for a useful analysis of JTPA IIB's overall performance in the state.**

   The current system of SDA outcome reports can be described as serendipitous. The SDAs' End-of-Year Program reports, which provide the most detailed accounts of summer program activities and results, vary widely in their formats and content across SDAs. While it is valuable for the regions to report in their own style and vernacular, this local flavor need not be lost if all SDAs also agreed upon a coherent series of common elements to establish a more uniform

reporting system (referencing JTPA IIB goals may be an effective starting place).

To a large degree, the state aggregated client data per SDA has questionable relevancy and is difficult to measure. Without *increasing* reporting requirements, the current IIB performance standards should be re-examined so that they can be stated in terms of measurable outcomes for a short-term summer program. Participant enrollment by activity and pre- and post-program test scores do provide useful data on an aggregate basis. However, the standardized termination data, as required on attached charts E2 and F2, attempts to measure termination outcomes that are inappropriate for a summer program. While reporting how many IIB participants returned to full-time school is important, the other outcome measures may be subjectively or inaccurately interpreted by the SDAs.

Revisiting the entire issue of outcomes and evaluations, in view of the large sums of summer dollars being expended, should have high priority. This applies whether required reporting is federally or state mandated.

II. JTPA IIB and Linkages

The Council recommends:

4. **Linkage systems should be developed between JTPA IIB programs and year-round school programs. These systems should facilitate both data and programmatic linkages. They must verify which participants return to school or enter employment and provide appropriate school personnel with a record of each JTPA IIB participant's summer experience.**

   There is little evidence that IIB summer program data reaches the participants' schools, or if it does that it is referenced for planning a participant's school year experience. For maximum effect, all of a youth's learning and work experiences should be coordinated. We recognize that SDAs alone cannot solve this problem of program segmentation. Schools, and where applicable other agencies, must play a major if not a lead role. However, a first step toward linking summer and year-round programs is establishing a system in which vital data is communicated effectively among the youth serving organizations.

Furthermore, the information exchange should be two-way — school to SDA and SDA to school.

5. **JTPA funds, preferably 8% education coordination grants, should be used to develop and maintain the linkage system in each SDA. Year-round linkage coordinator positions should be funded. These linkage coordinator positions should include at least one person who has experience with the region's school systems and one person familiar with summer youth programs.**

   The 1992 JTPA Amendments place a priority on using 8% funds for educational purposes. It is, therefore, very desirable to use a portion of these funds to connect summer basic skills enrichment to a student's year-round education program. To assist educational growth it is also appropriate to use these funds for coordinating summer and year-round work experiences as well as allowable support services.

6. **As JTPA Title IIC is being implemented throughout the Commonwealth, a review should be made of IIC to determine what programmatic, data and fiscal connections can be made between this new year-round youth program and the IIB summer program.**

   Following on the above recommendation, linkage between Title IIB and Title IIC could provide an even smoother path to coordinating summer and year round school programs for JTPA eligible youth. It is likely that students served by JTPA IIC may also participate in IIB activities. Furthermore, since many IIC programs will operate in school districts, enormous synergy could result from creative planning between JTPA and the public schools. Linkage coordinators could be extremely useful in connecting program planning and maintaining a program focus on the needs of individual students.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

CHART E2

JTPA TITLE IIB PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: TRENDS AND GOALS

INDICATOR	HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE		PLANNED
	FY'91	FY'92	FY'93
ENTERED EMPLOYMENTS			
YOUTH EMPLOYABILITY ENHANCEMENTS			
ENTERED OTHER TRAINING			
RETURNED TO FULL-TIME SCHOOL			
COMPLETED PROGRAM OBJECTIVES			
COMPLETED MAJOR LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
ATTAINED EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCY			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 1A

CHART F2
JTPA TITLE IIB
ANNUAL PARTICIPANT SUMMARY/PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Calendar Year 1992 (January 1992 - December 1992)

SDA NAME:_____ DATE:_____

	ANNUAL GOAL
I. TOTAL PARTICIPANTS	
II. TOTAL TERMINATIONS	
1. Entered Employment	
2. Youth Employability Enhancement	
a. Attained Employment Competency	
b. Returned to Full-Time School	
c. Completed Program Objectives	
d. Completed Major Level of Education	
e. Entered Other Training	
3. Other Terminations	
III. CURRENT PARTICIPANTS	
IV. EXPENDITURES	

PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES (Enter # of Enrollees in each Activity)	
ACTIVITY	# OF ENROLLMENTS
1. COMBINED WORK EXPERIENCE/REMEDIAL	
2. COMBINED VOC. EXPLORATION/REMEDIAL	
3. WORK EXPERIENCE only	
4. VOCATIONAL EXPLORATION only	
5. REMEDIAL - BASIC EDUCATION only	
6. E.S.L. - ENGLISH-AS-A-SECOND LANGUAGE only	
7. OTHER:	
8. OTHER:	
TOTAL ENROLLMENTS	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Questions for SYETP Participants

A. Origin of Involvement

- How did you find out about the SYETP?
- How easy/difficult was it to enroll in the program? (Eligibility requirements, etc.)
- How were you placed in your program? What kind of choices were you given?
- Have program goals been explained to you? Have you been given a clear reason for your participation?

B. Participation

- What kind of activities are you doing? What do you like the most?
- What activity is most common? How is most of your time spent within the program?
- What has been emphasized in the program?

C. Outcomes

- What has been learned through participating?
  - — What specific vocational or academic skills have you learned?
  - — What have you learned about work? Career possibilities?
  - — What do you consider the most important thing that you have learned through this program?

- Assessment/Projection:
  - — What effect, if any, has the program had on your thoughts about school/employment?
  - — What do you think you will remember most about participating?
  - — What advice would you give to someone who was going to be involved in the program next summer?

APPENDIX 5

JTPA TITLE IIB
FY 1993 TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

SDA	ORIGINAL ALLOCATION	EMERGENCY FUNDS	TOTAL
BERKSHIRE	$ 617,104	$ 361,472	$ 978,576
BOSTON	$ 2,193,694	$ 2,651,374	$ 4,845,068
BRISTOL	$ 1,841,063	$ 1,078,410	$ 2,919,473
BROCKTON	$ 820,072	$ 480,362	$ 1,300,434
FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE	$ 645,807	$ 378,284	$ 1,024,091
HAMPDEN	$ 1,449,478	$ 849,038	$ 2,298,516
LOWER MERRIMACK	$ 1,422,826	$ 833,426	$ 2,256,252
METRO NORTH	$ 1,890,267	$ 1,107,232	$ 2,997,499
METRO SOUTH/WEST	$ 1,445,378	$ 846,636	$ 2,292,014
NEW BEDFORD	$ 1,338,079	$ 784,879	$ 2,122,958
NORTHERN MIDDLESEX	$ 871,327	$ 510,384	$ 1,381,711
NORTH CENTRAL	$ 756,517	$ 443,133	$ 1,199,650
SOUTH COASTAL	$ 1,340,818	$ 785,391	$ 2,126,209
NORTH SHORE	$ 1,246,510	$ 730,149	$ 1,976,659
WORCESTER	$ 1,588,890	$ 930,700	$ 2,519,590
CAPE COD & ISLANDS	$ 1,033,981	$ 604,565	$ 1,638,546
TOTAL	**$ 20,501,811**	**$ 13,375,435**	**$ 33,877,246**

Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training

APPENDIX 6

JTPA TITLE IIB
FY 1993 ENROLLMENT

SDA	FY 1993 PLAN	EMERGENCY EXPANSION	TOTAL
BERKSHIRE	304	150	454
BOSTON	1,100	1,400	2,500
BRISTOL	1,200	600	1,800
BROCKTON	550	200	750
FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE	386	160	546
HAMPDEN	1,020	400	1,420
LOWER MERRIMACK	860	393	1,253
METRO NORTH	1,175	525	1,700
METRO SOUTHWEST	850	300	1,150
NEW BEDFORD	647	300	947
NORTHERN MIDDLESEX	550	275	825
NORTH CENTRAL	535	270	805
SOUTH COASTAL	816	534	1,350
NORTH SHORE	500	250	750
WORCESTER	887	630	1517
CAPE COD & ISLANDS	327	300	627
STATE TOTAL	**11,707**	**6,687**	**18,394**

Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training

SYEP PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

APPENDIX 7

COUNSELOR _____ ENROLLEE _____

AGENCY _____ DATE _____

WORKSITE SUPERVISOR _____

INSTRUCTIONS: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE COUNSELOR FOR EACH ENROLLEE AT THE END OF THE MONTH. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING, EMPHASIZING PROGRESSION OR REGRESSION IN EACH AREA.

1. ATTENDANCE: _____

2. PUNCTUALITY: _____

3. RELATIONSHIP WITH SUPERVISOR: _____

4. RELATIONSHIP WITH PEERS: _____

5. HOW WELL DOES HE/SHE COMPLETE ASSIGNED TASKS? _____

6. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: _____

PARTICIPANTS SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

Would you recommend that this trainee be re-hired?
Yes_____ No_____
Maybe_____

Please explain your answer. If you checked "Maybe", describe the circumstances under which we might re-hire.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Additional comments: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

APPENDIX 7

PERSONNEL EVALUATION/END OF SUMMER REPORT FOR 1992

WORKER_____ SUPERVISOR_____

Please evaluate this trainee on the following criteria. Circle the number that corresponds best to your rating of their performance in each area.

1 = Poor 2 = Needs Improvement 3 = Fair 4 = Very Good
5 = Excellent (An explanation is required for each negative rating, #1 or #2, and for the highest rating, #5.)

Steady worker/keeps busy.....	1	2	3	4	5
Tries to do good, quality work.....	1	2	3	4	5
Follows instructions.....	1	2	3	4	5
Able to work without constant supervision.....	1	2	3	4	5
Able to handle a variety of tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5
Cooperates with supervisor.....	1	2	3	4	5
Gets along with co-workers.....	1	2	3	4	5
Interest in learning new skills.....	1	2	3	4	5
Follows rules and procedures.....	1	2	3	4	5
Basic work attitudes/habits.....	1	2	3	4	5

VOCATIONAL TRAINING NEWS

The Independent Weekly Report on Employment, Training & Vocational Education

Vol. 24, No. 33
August 19, 1993

Labor Using New System To Monitor Summer JTPA Efforts

The Labor Department will use a new review system this year to oversee summer job training programs.

Last month, Labor sent its regional offices an updated monitoring guide that stresses identifying easily replicated program features. Labor ditched its prior compliance review reporting forms that were more of a checklist of standard program features.

Regional officials plan to visit 20 percent of each states' service delivery areas (SDAs) by next month to analyze programs. Those sites must include the 100 cities with the largest number of economically disadvantaged youths.

The regional officials also are to visit any SDA with a 1992 summer program allocation of at least $750,000, or any SDA that carried over at least 30 percent of its 1992 program year allocations into 1993.

Academic Enrichment

While Labor wants the new review system to better highlight successful and innovative programs, it still plans to use the review process to make sure states are adequately monitoring local programs and providing needed assistance.

The prime focus will be in making sure states are issuing supplementary guidance to help SDAs provide the academic enrichment portion of the summer jobs program. Clinton plans to expand the schoolsite component over the next few years, ultimately requiring that a third of all summer jobs money be spent on classroom services (VTN, April 17).

Labor's Employment and Training Administration says its regional offices' monitoring efforts should view the academic programs as a starting point for establishing school-to-work links that could be a part of President Clinton's massive plans for a national school-to-work system.

In a separate guidance letter to SDAs, ETA revised accounting for fiscal 1992 funds transferred from year-round training program coffers to summer job program coffers.

Transfers Not Reflected

When Congress amended JTPA in 1992, it allowed the one-time transfer to help states make the transition to a new system that separates youth and adult programs. Instructions on making the changes were released last November, but Labor has followed up on those guidelines by saying it will not issue a notice of obligation to states to reflect any transfer of funds.

States are to identify all transfers in the "remarks" section of the JTPA Semiannual Status Report for the period ending June 30, 1993, even if the transfers occurred before Dec. 31, 1992.

Because ETA will use those categories for program and budget purposes, including adjusting internal accounting records, "it is imperative that they be all inclusive and accurate," the guidance letter says.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE